REMARKS

[0010] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1, 3-10, 12-15, 17-19, 21 and 22 are currently pending

- Claims 2 and 11 are canceled herein

- Claims 1, 10 and 15 are amended herein

[0011] Claims 1 and 10 are amended to include subject matter from dependent claims 2 and 11, respectively.

Cited Documents

[0012] The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- Kenyon: Kenyon et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,792,430

- Batty: Batty et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,223,212

- Hatori: Hatori, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/00221122

- Farnham: Farnham et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,343,365

§§ 102 and 103 Rejections

[0013] Claims 1, 3, 6-10 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Kenyon.

[0014] Claims 2, 5, 11 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Kenyon in view of Batty. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

[0015] Claims 4 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Kenyon in view of Batty and in further view of Hatori. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

[0016] Claims 15, 17, 19 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Kenyon in view of Hatori. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

[0017] Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Kenyon in view of Hatori and in further view of Batty. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

[0018] Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Kenyon in view of Hatori and in further view of Farnham. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

[0019] Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant has revised independent claims 1, 10, 15 and 19.

[0020] **Independent claim 1**, as amended, recites a method of sharing computer objects comprising (Underlined text indicates amended language):

- storing in computer memory, association information relating to one or more associations between a selected object in a first computer space and one or more first objects in the first computer space, wherein the association information is determined automatically based upon prior interactions between <u>a</u> user and the objects in the first computer space,

and wherein the objects are at least one of files, applications, contacts or communications;

- sharing the selected object and the association information from the first computer space with a second computer space, the second computer space including one or more second objects that match the one or more first objects;
- identifying the one or more second objects in the second computer space;
- automatically forming one or more associations between the selected object and the second objects preexisting in the second computer space upon the sharing of the selected object and the association information from the first computer space to the second computer space;
- storing in the first computer space association information relating to an association between the selected object and the second computer space; and
- determining whether the association between the selected object and the second computer space is of an extent greater than a predetermined threshold;
- wherein the selected object is shared from the first computer space with the second computer space upon a determination that the association between the selected object and the second computer space is of an extent greater than the predetermined threshold.

[0021] The Office argues that Kenyon anticipates the subject matter of claim 1 (prior to the amendment to this claim). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejection and in the interests of expediting allowance of the application, independent claim 1 is amended as shown above. Dependent claim 2 is incorporated into claim 1 with this amendment. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Kenyon in view of Batty. Applicant respectfully submits that none of Kenyon, Batty or a combination thereof teaches or suggests incorporated **dependent claim 2**.

[0022] Kenyon is directed to a "method of linking together digital information objects of a digital information space." (Kenyon, Abstract) Kenyon recites the "overlay created by a first user can be shared with a second user to allow the second user to learn or get another opinion about an area by examining a network generation by the first user."

(Kenyon, Column 3, lines 34-37) Kenyon recites that the "user creates an overlay" (Kenyon, Column 4, line 1) and that the "content of an overlay preferably includes an index of URLs in the overlay; an index of overlay concepts, each concept described by keywords associated with the concept; and data on each URL containing the concepts." (Kenyon, Column 4, lines 47-50) Kenyon further recites that when "a document is displayed, the keywords contained in the document are highlighted to define overlay links." (Kenyon, Column 5, lines 14-15)

[0023] However, Kenyon fails to teach or suggest that "association information is determined automatically based upon prior interactions between a user and the objects" and "sharing the selected object and the association information." Instead, Kenyon uses "keywords" and links to other objects.

[0024] The Office cites primarily to Batty in dependent claim 2. Batty is directed to a "method and system for sharing negotiating capabilities when sharing an application with multiple systems." (Batty, Title) Batty recites that "the computers systems negotiate capabilities in an application sharing conference." (Batty, column 2, lines 44-45) Batty further recites that "when a capability is designated as being negotiated according to a max capability rule, then each computer system determines candidate capability values from the advertised capability values. Each computer system then sets the capability value for the capability to the maximum of all the determined candidate capability values." (Batty, Column 2, lines 56-61)

[0025] Batty does not teach or suggest

"storing in the first computer space association information relating to an association between the selected object and the second computer space; and **determining whether the association between the selected object and the second computer space is of an extent greater than a**

predetermined threshold; wherein the selected object is **shared from the first computer space with the second computer space** upon a determination that the association between the selected object and the second computer space is of an extent greater than the predetermined threshold,
as recited in amended claim 1 (Emphasis added)

[0026] Likewise, Batty does not teach or suggest a "predetermined threshold" and that "the selected object is shared" if the association "is of an extent greater than the predetermined threshold," as recited in amended claim 1. Instead, Batty "negotiates capabilities" so that "each computer system can **display an accurate representation of the output of the shared application**." (Emphasis added) (Batty, Column 4, lines 6-8)

[0027] Thus, claim 2 as incorporated into independent claim 1 is allowable over Kenyon and Batty, whether taken alone or in combination (assuming for the sake of argument that the documents can even be combined).

[0028] **Dependent claims 3-9** depend from independent claim 1 and are allowable by virtue of their dependency from allowable claim 1, as well as for the additional features that each recites.

[0029] **Independent claim 10** is rejected for similar reasons as claim 1. The Office argues that Kenyon anticipates the subject matter of claim 1 (prior to the amendment to this claim). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejection and in the interests of expediting allowance of the application, independent claim 10 is amended in a manner similar to claim 1. The arguments made above apply to claim 10. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 10 is now allowable over Kenyon and Batty, whether taken alone or in combination (assuming for the sake

of argument that the documents can even be combined) for at least reasons similar to those discussed above in regards to claim 1.

[0030] **Dependent claims 13 and 14** depend from independent claim 10 and are allowable by virtue of their dependency from allowable claim 10, as well as for the additional features that each recites.

Independent claim 15, as amended, recites a method of sharing computer objects, comprising (Underlined text indicates amended language):

- storing in a computer memory, association information relating to one or more associations between a selected object in a first computer space and a second computer space, wherein the association information is determined automatically based upon prior interactions between a user and one or more objects in the first computer space, and wherein the objects are at least one of files, applications, contacts or communications;
- initiating sharing of the selected object from the first computer space with the second computer space;
- determining an extent of the association of the selected object with the second computer space;
- permitting sharing of the selected object with the second computer space if it is determined that the extent of association of the selected object with the second computer space is greater than a predetermined threshold; and
- interfering with the sharing of the selected object with the second computer space if the association of the selected object with the second computer space is not of an extent greater than the predetermined threshold.

[0031] The Office argues that the subject matter of claim 15 is obvious over Kenyon in view of Hatori. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

[0032] Kenyon is directed to a "method of linking together digital information objects of a digital information space." (Kenyon, Abstract) Kenyon recites the "overlay created by a first user can be shared with a second user to allow the second user to learn or get another opinion about an area by examining a network generation by the first user." (Kenyon, Column 3, lines 34-37) Kenyon recites that the "user creates an overlay"

(Kenyon, Column 4, line 1) and that the "content of an overlay preferably includes an index of URLs in the overlay; an index of overlay concepts, each concept described by keywords associated with the concept; and data on each URL containing the concepts." (Kenyon, Column 4, lines 47-50) Kenyon further recites that when "a document is displayed, the keywords contained in the document are highlighted to define overlay links." (Kenyon, Column 5, lines 14-15)

[0033] However, Kenyon fails to teach or suggest that "association information is determined automatically based upon prior interactions between a user and the objects" and "sharing the selected object and the association information." Instead, Kenyon uses "keywords" and links to other objects.

[0034] Further, Kenyon fails to teach or suggest "association information is determined automatically based upon prior interactions between a user and one or more objects in the first computer space, and wherein the objects are at least one of files, applications, contacts or communications

[0035] Hatori, meanwhile, is directed to an "autonomic security settings switching based upon a network connection security profile." (Hatori, Title) Hatori recites that "the files sharing service is temporary terminated when a user intends to turn off the file sharing service." (Hatori, Paragraph [0010]) Hatori further recites that "the access control program is based on a user specification" and "presetting a security level (security information) in association with a location at which network connection is set up, such as "office", "home", "hotel", and "coffee shop". (Hatori, Paragraph [0012])

[0036] Hatori does not teach or suggest that "association information is determined automatically based upon prior interactions between a user and one or more objects in

the first computer space, and wherein the objects are at least one of files, applications, contacts or communications." Instead, Hatori discusses "security settings" in an "access control program" that are set by a "user". Hatori bases its security settings threshold on user input and the location of a network connection and not on the "extent" of automatically created associations based on "prior interactions between a user and one or more objects", as recited in claim 15. As such, Hatori fails to teach or suggest..."association information [that] is determined automatically based upon prior interactions between a user and one or more objects."

[0037] Applicant respectfully submits that claim 15 is now allowable over Kenyon and Hatori, whether taken alone or in combination (assuming for the sake of argument that the documents can even be combined).

[0038] **Dependent claims 17 and 18** depend from independent claim 15 and are allowable by virtue of their dependency from allowable claim 15, as well as for the additional features that each recites.

[0039] **Independent claim 19** is rejected for similar reasons as claim 15. Therefore, the arguments made above in regards to claim 15 are applicable to claim 19 and claim 19 is allowable for at least similar reasons. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 19 is allowable over Kenyon and Hatori, whether taken alone or in combination (assuming for the sake of argument that the documents can even be combined).

[0040] **Dependent claims 20 and 21** depend from independent claim 19 and are allowable by virtue of their dependency from allowable claim 19, as well as for the additional features that each recites.

Conclusion

[0041] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned representative for the Applicant before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/Dale G. Mohlenhoff 37,683/   Dated: July 1, 2009
Dale G. Mohlenhoff (dalem@leehayes.com; 509-944-4738)
Registration No. 37,683

Reviewer/Supervisor: Robert G. Hartman
Registration No. 58,970